

Hello to the committee chairs and members, Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

I am in opposition to raised bills 1210, 1094 and 1096.

Raised Bill 1210 calls for changes in wording in several places of Section 1. Section 53a-20 of the general statutes. I support most of those, but disagree with the lengthy run-on sentence at the end. "There shall be a presumption" is in the third person passive voice, and serves only to muddy the relatively direct language above it. "that the belief of a person....is a reasonable belief." is a recursive verbal construct and is needlessly repetitious since the phrase 'reasonably believes' appears twice in the text above it already. I believe that any act "concerning the use of deadly physical force" should be as concise and clear as humanly possible, and this last sentence is anything but.

Raised S.B. 1096 proposes prohibiting the possession of, and authorizes the seizure of ammunition under certain circumstances. I question how that could possibly be effective unless sales of ammunition were regulated and other laws passed prohibiting exchange of ammunition between individuals. If this is the 'foot-in-the-door' to requiring gun owners to show a permit to purchase ammunition, or creating records of how much of what caliber was purchased by whom, then I am very much opposed. What real purpose does this proposal serve?

Raised Bill 1094 would ban large capacity ammunition magazines. I think the proposal is flawed in many ways. 1) It would infringe on the second amendment and our state constitution.

2) It would set a dangerous precedent toward restricting all guns, first this class, then that... etc.

3) It pins the tail of, the rightful anger over the misuse of guns, on the wrong donkey, the guns.

4) It diverts attention away from identifying the people who misuse guns, before they do.

5) It ignores the positive attributes of large capacity magazines, in defensive situations.

6) It would punish the vast majority of responsible hi-cap. mag owners for the actions of very few.

7) It makes no distinction between rimfire calibers and centerfire calibers.

8) It would be nearly unenforceable on those who it is most intended to affect.

9) It would treat responsible gun owners like criminals, creating resentment and non-compliance.

10) It makes no distinction between owning a hi-cap. mag for home defense, versus a 'carry' gun.

11) It would send a message to law-abiding gun owners that their 'suitability' has been re-evaluated, and that the Department of Public Safety doesn't trust them with that much capacity.

12) It is an admission that instead of enforcing the laws we already have, or stiffening the penalties, we are admitting defeat and are resigned to passing legislation that only appears to do something.

13) It would further destabilize a society that is already strained to provide essential services.

14) I offer the following comparison to cars. To legally drive a car or to legally carry a gun, you need a license (permit). They both require passing a test that involves both written and actual use portions, almost always following a standardized course of instruction. But, if a criminal uses a car to commit a crime (and they do) should we pass a law that bans gas tanks larger than 10 gallons for every car owner in the state? If the law is passed, car owners would have 90 days to turn over any high-capacity gas tanks to the DPS or be guilty of a felony, would that be just? Perhaps the dangerous drivers have had their better senses corrupted by the largess of power that high-horsepower engines provide. Shall we pass a law restricting engines to 10 horsepower or less? If anyone feels a need to have more capacity than that, they can simply own multiple vehicles, and switch from one to the other very rapidly. So someone might argue that we need cars but don't need guns. Sure.... we don't need guns, like we don't need fire extinguishers.

For more of my thoughts on proposed bill 1094 please see the attached pages.

I thank you again for participating in this venue for public input.

Ron Smith March 2011

1) Step in wrong direction: Limiting the effectiveness, by restricting the magazine capacity, of a defensive tool is the first step in removing the tool altogether. Which is the first step in unarming the citizenry. Which is the first step in enslaving the people. We can not let that happen. So we say NO to the first step. NO, to disarmament of the people, and NO to under-armament of the people since it sets a precedent in the direction of dis-armament. Just say NO.

2) lack of trust: In a way, a ban on so-called high capacity magazines is not about crime prevention, or about criminals at all, because it won't affect them. It's about trust. It's about trusting the citizens who are gun owners, and have deliberately decided that a gun magazine greater than 10 rounds is appropriate. It's about one group of people trying to infringe on the rights of another group of people. What's worse is that most anti-gun people vote out of the fear of ignorance about guns. They have decided that they don't like guns, so they don't learn about them. Gun owners, on the other hand, have opinions about guns that are based on knowledge about guns. Gun owners, on average, know all the same things that non-gun owners know, but they also know about guns. Who's opinion is more valuable on the topic? Gun owners fear criminals, anti-gun people fear inanimate objects. Which group is more sane?

It's about one group, largely a subset of non-gun-owners (the anti-gun groups) saying to gun owners "we don't trust you". That "our fear of guns is more important than your knowledge and skills". So is this a sneak attack by anti-gun groups against law-abiding citizens, who have met the requirements for an eligibility certificate, or a 'permit to carry', but now their "suitability" is being called into question, again. It implies that gun owners can't be trusted with that much potency. What? It might go to their heads and corrupt them into becoming criminals? Puuleeeeeease. Stop already. What's next, claims that gun owners are daft because they have fallen under the influence of guns, and 'gun owner' is synonymous with 'gun nut'? It would not be right to force anti-gun people to go through the training and certification process to become gun owners. Personally I'm in favor of it, but that doesn't make it right. It's also not right for anti-gun people to try to force their views on gun owners. We just need to respect each other's differences, and get along here.

3) societal weakness: How many rounds in a magazine is O.K., 10, 15, 20? How many criminals in a city is O.K., 10, 15, 20, or more? If this bill proposed to restrict the number of criminals per unit area, would you even have one, single, law-abiding citizen objecting to it? I think not. So is this bill an admission that we have given up on effectively controlling crime, and now are reduced to proposing ways to LOOK like we are controlling crime?

4) Lack of logical connection: When the media sensationalizes 'gun crime' instead of just 'crime', it is easy, but wrong, to think that we can eliminate this (or these) particular form(s) of crime by eliminating guns (or even less so by restricting magazine capacity). There are no brackets around a segment of crime by which we can starve out the crime by depriving criminals of a certain tool, and that is even assuming the ability to legislate the tool out of this state. Criminals will use what they have, to do what they do, always have, always will. I just don't think there will ever be a criminal who is going to pick up their illegal gun, put it back down, and say to him/her self "I'm not going to use my gun to commit this [fill in the name of a crime / illegal activity] today because this gun is equipped with a high-capacity magazine, and there is a law against that". We need to focus on putting pressure on criminals (the unstable elements in society), not insulting and enraging the sportsmen/sportswomen and other law-abiding people (the stabilizing elements).

5) A comparison of need: Average (typical) citizens need high-capacity magazines more than law-enforcement officers do. I'm not saying that they shouldn't have them also, just making a comparison. When anyone, peace officer or citizen, finds themselves in harm's way, certain physiological changes occur.

- breathing increases, heart starts pounding.
- adrenaline shoots up.

- vision narrows and becomes more acute.
- large muscle groups prepare for 'fight or flight'.
- instinctive reactions predominate, and cognitive processes (decision making) is difficult.
- fine motor skills go right down the drain.

Let me say that again, **fine motor skills are severely challenged!** Changing from one magazine to another requires **fine motor skills** (fingers, not whole limbs). Smart citizens, like peace officers, should practice with their gun. That way if they ever need to use it they won't get snarled up in thinking about how to operate the tool when their decision-making ability needs to be focused on what is going on around them. There is a difference in the training available to the citizen versus the peace officer. Many public shooting ranges prohibit practicing drawing from holsters and magazine changes, but all peace officer ranges allow it, and many require it. Additionally, a person who is repeatedly exposed to the kind of stress that causes those physiological changes (peace officer) gradually acquires the ability to function better under those conditions. A citizen doesn't usually (excepting military and a few others) get that repetitious training, and is likely to be highly affected by the situation. If this bill passes, people (huge numbers of people) who had previously felt confident in having ONE high-capacity magazine for their home-protection tool will be worried about fumbling a magazine change in their once-in-a-lifetime (hopefully never) moment of need. And for what? What is the upside to this?

6) Erosion of essential services: Present-day budget crunches at every level, Federal, State and local, have been, and are having negative effects on essential services. Legislation, Judicial processes, and on-the-street law enforcement have been strained, and limited. People become reliant on (and dependent to) organized protective services, which makes sense in good times, both for economic efficiencies and the benefits of specialization. In not-good times, the common person feels more responsibility to be prepared to defend and protect themselves. We read the papers, we know that services are eroding, and we suspect we aren't being told the whole story. What police department is going to advertise that they can no longer staff to the level they previously estimated that we need, or afford the ammunition to train as frequently as they did? Who has the time to watch all of the legislation to see that as quickly as a pen stroke, another leg of the stabilizing factors in our society hasn't been kicked out from under us so that the government can pay the interest on its debt (our debt). Do we draw a line and say, ... If THIS happens, then I'll go out and buy that 9mm handgun with a hi-capacity magazine, and then IT does happen, and WHOA I'm not even allowed to own that gun/magazine because someone has already kicked that leg out from under the table. That's just not right. What is there to fear? Fiscal erosion combined with irresponsible monetary policy, plus a big dose of entitlement-program spending, and a prison system that just can't keep up. Let's not make it worse with egregious, knee-jerk (feels-good to do something, or do anything) legislation.

7) Doesn't stick criminals, but galls everyone else: Who is this legislation supposed to affect, and how? Let's assume this bill is NOT a blatant first step by the anti-gun groups to dis-arm our citizens. We'll assume this is intended to prevent some segment of violent crime. Let's draw a word-picture of this archetypal criminal. Most crimes in which a gun is mis-used are committed by repeat offenders. They already have a 'rap sheet'. They are not likely to be approved for an eligibility certificate (to own a gun kept in one's home). Even less likely to be found 'suitable' for a pistol permit (to carry). So if they have a gun it is likely that the gun itself is an illegal gun (hot, stolen, black market). Their possessing of it is breaking another law. If they take it into public (rather necessary for most crimes) a third law is broken. Then they commit the crime itself, and are breaking one or more OTHER laws. Do we really think that stacking one more law on top of all those others is going to make a difference? In the criminal mind, will this have even one shred of deterrence? Not probable. So, since this legislation (if passed) isn't likely to affect the criminals (a small fraction of society), let's look at who it would affect.

A) It would directly affect those who currently own guns and those who decide to become gun owners (a much larger fraction of society). Most high-capacity mags are owned by law-abiding citizens. Would law enforcement officers be allowed to have High-Capacity mags in their own (private) guns, or just in their duty guns? Would this apply to the 22 caliber 'plinking' rifle that fathers hand down to their sons? Would it apply to ownership across-the-board even

for people who shoot only on their own property? Would it apply to home defense tools, or just to carry guns? I think we can safely predict that many law abiding gun owners will be angered by it. They would either turn in their high capacity mags and have a lasting resentment toward the government that imposed this draconian and senseless measure, or they would not turn them in, and risk being found with them. This is the worst possible scenario, because it would force them to become criminals (ethically) to do what they think is right (morally) in a small but important way. The bar would be lowered, psychologically, that separates the law-abiding (socially stabilizing) citizen, from the criminal (de-stabilizing). If you treat your law-abiding citizens like criminals, more of them will act the part.

B) It would indirectly affect everyone in this society (the whole 'fraction' = 1/1), yes everyone. It decreases the deterrent effect of private gun ownership, and it weakens social stability.

8) "If guns cause crimes, all of mine are defective." --- Ted Nugent ---

If gun magazines which hold more than ten rounds cause crime, then forks and knives cause obesity. Add in those culprits, large spoons, ooooh they're really bad.

Guns don't cause crime, people do. People also prevent and resist crime. Guns empower the criminal, but they also empower people to prevent and resist crime. High-capacity magazines raise the empowerment on both sides, unless and until, something unbalances that. Something like a law that takes high-capacity mags away from one group but not the other.

Laws don't "make it so", adherence to laws does. If one group adheres to the law and the other does not, a 'tipping factor' is unbalanced. Once tipped, the result is hard to predict, but the "law of unintended consequences" is wide open and never rests. Has this bill been thought through?

9) Anti-nut, not anti-gun-mag: In any population, there are a handful of 'disturbed' individuals who are bound-and-determined to inflict themselves on society. Some of them choose to mis-use guns as a vehicle to announce their evil to the world. Occasionally they augment their gun with a high-capacity magazine. If (and it's a big, BIG, if) those magazines could be made unavailable to these 'nuts' and criminals, while still available to the military, F.B.I., C.I.A., state and local police, and others, would it prevent these violent events? Could it even ameliorate the tragedy, or lessen the number of events? Or would the inventive, and frustrated, criminal mind simply choose another vehicle for self expression? Abductions, bombs, and many other weapons are available, as we see, looking around the world.

10) Every right comes with a responsibility: S.B. 1094 is not so much about gun magazine capacity, as it is about the preservation of the freedom of choice. The forefathers of this country risked (and some gave) their lives, to the cause of liberty, by which they secured freedom for this country. Freedom from oppression, tyranny, coercion, arbitrary rule, and attack from outside our borders. Do you think that they would have taken perfectly good muskets and bent the barrels, or carried less powder and shot into the battle? Our current-day patriots, law-abiding citizens, are at risk each day from oppressive crime, home invasion and attack from within our borders. Do you think that they should take perfectly good guns and bend the barrels or equip them fewer rounds than the guns were intended to hold?

Crime such as; assault, robbery, rape, and sometimes murder are as much acts of coercion as is the tyranny of autocratic rule. They are similar in that both are arbitrary assertions of wrongful authority. The difference is that crime tends to be more; isolated, random, and sudden. The framers of our constitution recognized that we as individuals are responsible for standing up to the wrongful authority that criminals present; and to do that we need to be armed. Well armed. We, the people, only have the right to be free from the fear and oppression of wrongful authority in proportion to the responsibility which we shoulder to defend that freedom. To expect the right, and yet be complacent about the responsibility is the height of conceit and entitlement-attitude. To deserve the right of freedom, we need to be well-armed and mentally prepared to responsibly enforce that right, whether the threat is from without (attack and terrorism), or from within (the erosion of infringing legislation like this proposed bill S.B. 1094.

11) "Freedom is two wolves and one lamb, voting on what to have for lunch. Liberty is a well-

armed lamb contesting the vote." --- Ben Franklin ---

It is every citizen's duty to uphold Freedom in this country, which occasionally requires some few citizens to exercise their Liberty by defending themselves. If the wolves come to my door, my definition of well-armed may include a magazine capacity greater than ten rounds. And I don't think anyone else should be re-defining 'well-armed' for me either.

"Those who would give up Essential Liberty to obtain a little Temporary Security, deserve neither liberty nor security." --- Ben Franklin ---

Essential Liberty means each citizen taking personal responsibility for their own protection.
Temporary Security means to abdicate responsibility for your protection to others.

An example of this is giving up personal armament (magazine capacity) hoping that in a time of need, peace officers (who are still allowed to have that magazine capacity) will be right at your elbow, ready and willing to defend you. This is physically impossible. Police can't be everywhere, all the time (nor would we want them to be). They don't read minds and can't predict when or where the next crime will occur. So they are largely reactive, not proactive, nor 100% preventive. It's the best they can do. The only people who can be everywhere, all the time, IS the people. We, the people. To the people of this state--- be well-armed, and well-trained in the use of those arms, crime will go somewhere else or cease to exist. So, how many rounds = well-armed?

12) The second amendment: Many people refer to the 2nd amendment as though it is the origin of the right to keep and bear arms. The 'right' to defend oneself, and to protect one's family pre-dates the U.S. Constution. It pre-dates the Connecticut State Constitution. It is nature's way, and was conferred on sentient creatures by the creator. Any government which seeks to strip that right from people is by definition oppressive, and should be overthrown. The documents of a national or state constitution can do nothing more than repeat, reinforce, and codify the right which already exists.

To successfully defend oneself, from force, sometimes requires using force, whatever force is necessary to prevail. The definition of how much force is adequate force, not more perhaps, but certainly not less. With this in mind, a free society should allow people, who show themselves to be responsible, to decide on appropriate arms. The laws should be there to prevent people who are 'not suitable' from access to arms. That's it, just red light or green light, not shades of gray. The objective should be to have as many 'suitable' gun owners as possible. When you have a gun permit, you have more 'skin in the game', so it encourages more-responsible behavior, not less. Having more to lose promotes maturity, and responsibility. Magazine capacity is a 'tempest in a teacup', a storm of emotion over something which should be a non-issue. Let's get more people to be gun owners, and we'll have far fewer problems with the unsuitable minority.

13) On legal grounds: This bill clearly Infringes on the 2nd amendment right to keep and bear arms. To even be considered it should spell-out which "compelling state interest(s)" are at stake, and how this act would unquestionably secure those interests. Shouldn't that be written in the space provided labeled 'PURPOSE'? The proposal should also list the options and alternatives to this act to similarly secure those "compelling state interests". Instead, by leaving that out, it implies there are no other ways to accomplish the objective. Is this the best that our elected legislators can do? Is it even acceptable? Does this proposal even merit the safety committee's time and attention? I would send it back directly, and if the 'introducer' can't (or won't) present something more detailed and compelling, just don't give it the time of day.

14) Not good legislation: With every right comes a responsibility. Legislation should not be meddling with and micro-managing how people choose to exercise their rights. Legislation should be promoting and encouraging people who are acting responsibly, also restricting & punishing those who aren't. This bill proposes to do the opposite. Instead of stiffening the penalties for criminals who mis-use guns, and strengthening the enforcement of those laws, it

restricts the law-abiding citizens and threatens them with 'felony by edict'. To think that a tool which a thoughtful and deliberate individual, either has already purchased or would have purchased eventually, is suddenly illegal and carries a penalty of felony, is severely restrictive and punitive. Way over-reaching.

15) the criminal's whipping-boy: This bill, S.B.1094 proposes to 'take something away', from someone, actually a large group of someones. The way it is written differs from how it would work. The intent may be to deprive criminals and 'nuts' from having high-capacity magazines. The wording is that it takes them away from (almost) everyone. The application of the act would only be effective on law-abiding citizens. So the net effect is that the small number of mis-users go right-on mis-using them, and the large number who are not mis-using them get punished and have them taken away. This is not fair, not smart, not just and not right... and this is serious legislation? The stable, law-abiding, citizen who either is, or will become a gun owner is to be the legislative 'whipping boy' for the criminals?

16) "An armed society is a polite society." --- Robert A. Heinlein
I would embellish this wisdom to say "A well-armed society is a very polite society."

Is this bill intended to reduce gun-crime? "gun-crime" is an oxymoron, here's why.....
The highest purpose of guns, their intended use, and their value to society is that they make each person more equal to every other person. They level the 'playing field' of human rights. They make the rights of a physically smaller, weaker person equal to those of a larger, stronger person. Guns are the fulcrum of an egalitarian society. High-capacity magazines strengthen the good purposes of gun ownership. Besides being a huge boost to equal rights, a surplus of firepower has a stabilizing effect similar to the "assured mutual destruction" between superpower countries. Called detente, it promotes the deliberate non-use of overwhelming power because it is held in balance by an equally overwhelming power. Criminals don't respect much, but they respect firepower. Bullies (thugs, home invaders, gangsters) often present themselves collectively against individuals, to assure they are successful in over-powering their intended victim. Because of this, guns need to be able to deliver sufficient firepower to repel and deter more than a single attacker. Criminals respect high-capacity mags. For these reasons, conjoining the words gun, and crime, is more than misleading and twisted, it is an insidious ploy by anti-gun people and media sensationalists to create a subliminal negative association in the minds of people who aren't aware of the true value of gun ownership. Please don't use "gun-crime" in legislative documents, it's just CRIME, sometimes with mis-use of guns.

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent... The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."
-- Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis

17) Everywhere that you see or hear the phrase "...used a gun in committing this crime..." it is wrong. Guns are MISUSED when they are involved in criminal activity. The forefathers of this country USED guns to liberate this country from the tyranny of oppressive rule.

18) Comparison to cars: To legally drive a car, you need a license. The license requires passing a test including both written and on-road portions. Most folks qualify for this early in life by taking "driver's ed." which is a standardized course of instruction. To legally carry a gun, you need a permit (license). The permit requires a standardized course of instruction culminating in both written and actual use portions. Each year, some few cars, and some few guns, are mis-used. Often this results in harm, injury and death. Many similarities up to this point. When a driver, possibly through negligence or irresponsible decisions, causes an 'accident' frightening or harming someone else, they are covered by 'no fault' insurance. Can I get one of those 'no fault' policies on my gun? Perhaps the dangerous drivers have had their better senses corrupted by the largess of power that high-horsepower engines provide. Shall we pass a law restricting

engines to 10 horsepower or less? If anyone feels a need to have more capacity than that, they can simply own multiple vehicles, and switch from one to the other very rapidly. Perhaps it would be appropriate to require an arbitrarily expensive 'federal tax stamp' for dump-truck ownership. Or perhaps all law-abiding vehicle owners in the state (only Ct. vehicle owners) should go back to driving the 'horse and carriage' so that if our vehicles are stolen and used in a crime, the DPS will have an advantage in chasing down the 'getaway carriage' in their 300 H.P. cruisers.

A further look into the legislative landscape, if we go down this road, reveals that a criminal may be driving around in a high-horsepower vehicle containing a high-capacity gas tank but the authorities aren't even aware of it because the criminal doesn't register it. But the if the hapless law-abiding citizen dares to even pull the car-cover off his '69 Cuda Hemi, he risks being cited for 'breach of peace' and the authorities will take all of his cars away. Then he can wait over a year to get a hearing to try to get them back (if they haven't been arbitrarily destroyed in the meantime).

So you might argue that we need cars but don't need guns. Riiliiiiight.... we don't need guns, like we don't need fire extinguishers.

19) The solutions to crime do not include forcing Law-abiding citizens to backpedal on defense technology. Would it make sense to force the U.S. military to cut in half the number of rounds of [fill in the blank with; missiles, bombs, rifle cartridges etc.] just because terrorists misuse similar armament? Unilateral disarmament doesn't work, ever. Unilateral disarmament of the 'good guys' is so foolish it's beyond description. The U.S. military is still the largest deterrent to; chaos, tyranny, and terrorism in the world. Cut it in half? Not smart. The armed citizens in each of our states are the largest deterrent to; societal instability, governmental tyranny, and crime in the country. Restrict magazine capacity? Not smart.

The solutions to crime are found in cultural traditions and socio-economic stability. I ask for our stateswomen & statesmen to legislate for cultural maturity and to promote a socio-economic meritocracy which is colorblind and race agnostic. This will be 'tough work'. Far tougher than legislating against an accessory to a tool which is occasionally misused for wrongdoing.

20) The way humans decide how and when to act is by by constantly re-balancing the equation of perceived risk, against expectations of reward. When the reward (the objective) is personal safety and home security, the risk side of the equation is concerned with threats (either real or imagined). If we are not currently in a threat crisis, then we have to use our imagination to estimate the threat. There are two components to this estimate; 1) propability of occurance, and 2) consequence(s) of occurance. The equation looks like this.... $RISK = (probability) \times (consequence)$ in words, RISK equals probability times consequence. If either the probability OR the consequence is really, really large, the other factor can be very small and the risk is still substantial. Let's apply this understanding to the topic of 'use of lethal force' in a personal-defense situation. We can probably agree that for most people in this country (and in this state) the probability of having such a situation in any single lifetime is rather low. It's also self-evident that for most law enforcement officers the probability is higher. Interestingly though, the consequences of grave physical injury or death, are almost identical. Since those consequences are just about at the top of the list, whether the probability is small or very slight doesn't matter. The calculation of risk is essentially the same.

After we calculate the risk, the next task is to determine an appropriate response. Peace officers have almost universally determined that an appropriate response is to equip themselves with a firearm and ammunition. It seems equally rational for the non peace officer to do the same. The difference in probability of occurance is more appropriately adjusted for by how-often and for how long to keep this equipment at-hand, not in the selection of the equipment. As much as we love our local and state peace officers and military men and women, I doubt that anyone feels as though their own life (or family) is any less worthy of protection. The people who are professionals in this self-defense and public protection field, meaning the state and local police and others, have determined that they need high-capacity magazines. I believe that my fellow citizens and I have just as much right to those same tools, since our lives are not worth less than

theirs.

21) magazine capacity as deterrence: Our country maintains a military to send others the signal "nothing in our country is worth risking the loss of yourself and everything in your country, so don't even think about invading us" Each household in this country should be a reflection of that signal,

to criminals, "invade these premises at risk of your peril". Each person should be a tiny mirror of that reflection signaling "Invade my person at the risk of your demise". Then we will know the peace that comes from the strength of maturity, reason, and wisdom. The way to send that signal is by being both armed and trained in the use of those arms.

In nature, when animals play, it is often a rehearsal of the skills they need to survive. I encourage anyone reading this to go play, at paintball. There is very little risk (a low consequence factor) and much can be learned. It is truly surprising how quickly your supply of ammunition is consumed. Can't get to a paintball venue? Step up to the line in front of a dartboard. Imagine one attacker, can you throw a 'bullseye' on your first toss? Now imagine three assailants, can you put three darts in the 'incapacitate' zone in a row? O.K. keep tossing until you get all three where they might have done some good. How many did it take? Were you calm and collected? Now try banging your head against the wall twice, doing eight squat thrusts (to get the adrenaline up a little, and yelling at the top of your lungs for 15 seconds. Repeat the 'three in the zone' test. How many this time? Now let's ask the question 'how many rounds are the right number to send the message that your home and your person are not to be invaded without significant risk to your attacker(s)?

22) I believe it is self evident that people have the right to defend and protect themselves and their families. Since it makes no sense to take up a rock against arrows and spears, nor to bring a knife to a gunfight, they must arm themselves appropriately for the times in which they live. This bill raises the question of "how many rounds in a magazine is appropriate?". People need to choose a level of technology which gives them a fighting chance to prevail over foreseeable threats, in their homes, and to their persons. The leading authorities on what constitutes an appropriate level of technology are; the F.B.I., the military, the various state and local protective forces etc. If they are choosing high-capacity magazines, then I will follow their example and choose the same. I don't accept "do as I say, not as I do". I take their example as a 'recommendation' of what works. I believe in "doing what works".

Thank you for reading this and please vote with your conscience wide open.